



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,780	11/26/2001	Gerard Scott Freeland	AZON3ADIV/dln	5821

7590

01/28/2003

THE FIRM OF HUESCHEN AND SAGE

500 Columbia Plaza

350 East Michigan Ave.

Kalamazoo, MI 49007

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/992,780	11/26/2001	Freeland	AZON 3A DIV

EXAMINER	
Sergent	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711	6

DATE MAILED:

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

The reply filed on November 6, 2002 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Firstly, applicants' response to the rejection of claims 35-39 set forth within paragraph 3 of the Office action of July 1, 2002 appears improper and/or incomplete; initially, it is unclear that the viscosity of the claim pertains to the prepolymer; additionally, despite applicants' response, support has not been found in the examples for the claimed viscosity range. The specification at line 4 of page 10 specifies that the prepolymer has a viscosity of 1200 to 26000 cps at room temperature. Even if the examples cited the endpoints of the claimed range, it is further noted that values within examples provide support only for the value, *per se*, not a range of values. Secondly, applicants' response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 52, 53, and 54 set forth within paragraph 4 of the Office action is confusing. It is not seen that applicants' amendment, "weight/weight", has clarified the basis for each weight percent value. In other words, it is unclear if the respective weight percents are based on the weight of the prepolymer, the curative, on one of the constituents, such as component a) or b), or on the elastomer. Thirdly, applicants have failed to address the examiner's rejection within respect to claims 38, 39, 43, and 44 within paragraph 4. Lastly, with respect to the rejection set forth within paragraph 5 of the Office action, applicants have failed to address the viscosity of the prepolymer. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Additionally, the following issue has been noted and will be addressed within the next Office action, if not addressed by applicants in response to this letter. Within claims 41 and 53, the last value, "0.006%", is not within the range set forth for the last component of claim 34. Therefore, these claims fail to further limit claim 34.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

R. Sergent

January 26, 2003


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER